

Appl. No. : **09/938,804**
Filed : **August 24, 2001**

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed July 10, 2006, Applicant has amended the application as above. Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's finding of patentable subject matter in Claims 2-4, 5-14, 22-23 and 36. Claims 1, 15, 19, 25-27, and 35 have been amended. Claims 1-36 are now pending in this application. No new matter is added. Applicant respectfully requests the entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the remarks set forth below.

Discussion of the Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 15, 19, 24-27, and 30-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Huttenlocher (US 6,249,604) and Zhou et al. (US 5,892,843).

With respect to independent Claim 1, neither Huttenlocher nor Zhou teaches or suggests the feature "locating one or more bytes having no non-white pixels in the received bitmap, wherein the locating identifies gaps within the pattern of character strokes; c) inserting bytes having non-white pixels into a series of bytes having no non-white pixels such that at least a portion of the identified gaps is eliminated" as recited in the amended Claim 1. In the Office Action, the Examiner took the position that though Huttenlocher did not teach the feature of identification of gaps within the pattern of character strokes, Zhou did teach that feature.

However, neither Zhou nor Huttenlocher teaches "inserting bytes having non-white pixels into a series of bytes having no non-white pixels such that at least a portion of the identified gaps is eliminated". According to Figure 4 and column 5, line 50 to column 6, line 30 of Zhou, holes in the connected component (characterized by the Examiner as gaps within the pattern of character strokes) are identified so that characters can be distinguished from non-characters based on the number of holes. Zhou does not teach eliminating a portion of the identified holes. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Huttenlocher and Zhou.

Each of the independent Claims 15, 19, 25-27, and 35 recites a similar feature as discussed above with regard to Claim 1. For at least the same reason stated above, they are

Appl. No. : 09/938,804
Filed : August 24, 2001

patentable over the combination of Huttenlocher and Zhou and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Dependent Claims

Claims 2-4, 16-18, 20-24, and 28-34 are dependent either directly or indirectly on the above-discussed independent Claims 1, 15, 19, 25-27, and 35. Applicant respectfully submits that pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶4, the dependent claims incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which they refer and include their own patentable features, and are therefore in condition for allowance. Furthermore, although Applicant has not discussed the specific rejections to dependent claims, Applicant does not necessarily agree with the characterizations of the prior art made by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of all claim rejections and prompt allowance of the claims.

Conclusion


In light of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are specifically requested. In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the above-identified application are in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner finds any impediment to allowing all claims that can be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 10/15/06

By: 
John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550